

Nina Ilić*
Faculty of Philosophy
University of Novi Sad

UDC 371.3::811.111'243:[159.928.23-057.875
DOI: 10.19090/gff.2019.1.57-74
Originalni naučni rad

PERSONALITY-MOTIVATION PROFILES OF TWO GIFTED L2 ENGLISH STUDENTS**

This paper examines a variety of personality and motivational characteristics of two talented foreign language learners. The purpose of the case study is to present personality-motivation profiles of two teenage gifted L2 English students. The EPI (Emotions Profile Index) and Intrinsic Motivation Inventory tests were used as instruments. The study revealed that two different profiles of gifted students can be distinguished: artistic and scientific. As far as their motivation is concerned, the results show that gifted students can be both intrinsically and extrinsically oriented. The conclusion is that different personality and motivational characteristics of talented students need to be taken into account in order to create an effective curriculum. Further investigation into the field is required, to confirm these results.

Keywords: personality, motivation, gifted students, second language learning, teaching

1. INTRODUCTION

Giftedness is a concept which has intrigued researchers and educators for centuries because it is difficult to define. First definitions of giftedness were related to the interviewees' intelligence quotient (IQ) scores on the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Test (Terman–Oden, 1947). However, over the last few decades, this attitude has changed to include more than one kind of intelligence. The most famous attempt in this direction was Gardner's definition of Multiple Intelligences (Gardner, 1983). Gardner (1983) distinguishes between eight types of intelligence: linguistic, logical-mathematical, musical, spatial, bodily-kinesthetic, interpersonal, intrapersonal, and naturalist. This paper focuses on personality and motivational

* nina.ilic.ns@gmail.com

** This paper is part of the research on Project No. 178002, entitled Languages and Cultures in Time and Space, which is funded by the Serbian Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development.

characteristics of students whose linguistic intelligence is highly-developed, i.e. they are talented language learners and achieve exceptional results in that field.¹

When defining giftedness, consideration should be given not only to its cognitive, but to its affective dimension as well. Personality characteristics of gifted learners are of paramount importance to “the learning process, to the full development of the individual, and to the future of society” (Silverman, 1994: 325). This is the reason equal attention must be paid to both the cognitive and affective development of a talented individual. Gifted students usually lead very intense emotional lives, which can result in their becoming “anxious, depressed, alienated, socially inept, or emotionally blocked,” (Silverman, 1994: 327) if their emotional needs are not catered for. Some definitions of giftedness focus exactly on learners’ high sensitivity to and understanding of cognitive and emotional experiences (Kokot, 1999, as cited in Kahyaoglu, 2013: 890). Therefore, it is necessary to take emotional characteristics of gifted learners into account in order to create an effective curriculum.

Finally, recent studies have shown that gifted students are highly motivated (Kahyaoglu, 2013; Al-Khasawneh–Al-Omari, 2015), which implies that motivation plays an important part in defining giftedness. In Renzulli’s (1986: 67) three-ring definition of giftedness; task-commitment, above average ability and creativity are taken as the defining factors.

The aim of the present case study is to examine gifted students’ personality and motivation. First, the dominant personality traits and motivation of gifted learners will be discussed. Then, the personality-motivation profiles of two talented L2 learners will be presented and analyzed.

2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Starting from the different aspects of giftedness outlined in the introduction, personality traits of gifted learners will be discussed first, followed by a brief overview of gifted students’ motivation. The scope of this paper does not allow for a comprehensive review of all characteristics. Some of the defining traits of the

¹In contemporary literature on second/foreign language learning, the term ‘gifted/talented learner’ is often replaced by the term ‘good language learner (GLL)’. However, much of GLL studies focus on the learning strategies good language learners use (Rubin, 2005). Since learning strategies are not the subject of this paper, the author chooses the term ‘gifted/talented learner’.

gifted: intense emotions, perfectionism, creativity and introversion (Heylighen, 2007) will be presented.

2.1. Intense emotions

As Klein (2007) notes, the emotional lives of the gifted are at the same level as their intellectual lives, meaning that they experience stronger emotions in comparison with others. Among other emotions, the following are highlighted (2007: 119-120):

- “moodiness” i.e. quick shifts of extremely positive and extremely negative emotions;
- “body sensations such as stomachaches or headaches or nausea, which are symptoms of fearful feelings”;
- “timidity or shyness as an expression of strong feelings of inhibition”;
- “strong emotional memories of past experiences that are relived when they are remembered”;
- “fears, anxiety, or guilt about mistakes that may happen”;
- “strong empathy for others”;
- “self-criticism and feelings of inadequacy and worthlessness”.

This tendency towards strong feelings may lead to their anxiety, because gifted children can imagine a number of negative outcomes in a new situation (Klein, 2007). Although a low level of anxiety might facilitate language learning (Gass-Selinker, 1994; Lightbrown-Spada, 2006), anxiety was found to negatively correlate with gifted-learners’ language performance (Kamarulzaman-Ibrahim-Yunus, & Ishak, 2013). Therefore, it is very important that their educators support them, whenever they go through an unknown experience.

2.2. Perfectionism

A personal trait that seems to form an important part of the gifted students’ personality is perfectionism. As Kirk–Gallagher–Coleman and Anastasiow state; perfectionism is “the combination of thoughts and behaviors associated with high standards or high expectations for one’s own performance” (2009: 296). Sometimes, this striving for perfection can lead to overreaction (Kirk et al, 2009).

According to Parker (2002), as cited in Kerr (2009: 676), gifted students can be divided into three groups according to their level of striving for perfection: non-perfectionists, healthy perfectionists, and dysfunctional perfectionists. The first

have low expectations from themselves, the second are extroverted, conscientious and agreeable, whereas the third score the highest on a measure of neuroticism. This is why talented children need to learn that they cannot do everything perfectly (Klein, 2007).

Closely related to perfectionism is the issue of depression. It has been suggested that highly creative individuals are more susceptible to mental disorders (Kirk et al, 2009). However, Cross–Cassady and Miller (2006) have shown that the suicide rate is not higher among talented students than the normal population.

2.3. Creativity

Creativity is closely linked to intelligence in the sense that the higher the level of intelligence, the greater the chances for creation (Simonton, 1999: 79). The following six characteristics of gifted students take on an important role in defining creativity (Simonton, 1999: 90-92):

- “an impressive array of intellectual, cultural, and aesthetic interests”, which allows the gifted to create unique associations;
- openness to “novel, complex, and ambiguous stimuli in their surroundings”;
- ability to “attend loosely to more than one idea or stimulus at the same time, even when these cognitions and perceptions bear no obvious relationship to each other”;
- cognitive and behavioral flexibility, which allows them to “incubate the puzzle for some time, taking advantage of any accidental stimulation provided in the interim”;
- introverted personality, because “creativity requires long hours of solitary contemplation”;
- being “independent, autonomous, unconventional and perhaps even iconoclastic”.

All these characteristics are important in outlining a personality profile of a gifted L2 learner.

2.4. Socialization issues and introversion

Because of all the above-mentioned characteristics, talented children can sometimes have problems finding a suitable social group to belong to. Gifted students are socially more mature than their peers. However, their social needs do not differ from those of their peers. They also need the support of their family and a

network of close friends with whom they share their ideas (Pfeiffer, 2008). This is exactly where the problem lies; they need friends, but find making friends very difficult because of their different interests and aspirations. Moreover, because of their advanced cognitive abilities, they experience worries which are not common for their peers (Pfeiffer, 2008). Therefore, it not surprising that gifted children report that they have few friends (Janos–Fung, & Robinson, 1985; Janos–Marwood, & Robinson, 1985).

Studies have shown that talented children tend to be more introverted (Delbridge – Parker, & Robinson, 1989; Gallagher, 1990; Hoehn–Bireley, 1988; Mills–Parker, 1998; Sak, 2004), which can diminish their need for social interaction with peers to a certain extent. In his analysis of the relationship between temperament and giftedness, Sak (2004), as cited in Kerr (2009: 279), found that gifted students were significantly more introverted than the normative group. The same study showed that gifted students were much more intuitive. It should be added that gifted students are often not lonely because of their introversion, since they prefer spending time alone, with their ideas (Kerr, 2009). This is not to say that talented students cannot be extroverted. Actually, some studies have found that extroverts are more frequent than introverts among the gifted population (Williams, 1992).

2.5. Motivation

When discussing motivation, it is important to make a distinction between self-determined and controlled actions. Self-determined actions are those which individuals freely choose and want to do. This means that the only incentive for undertaking these kinds of actions comes from one's enjoyment and interest in a particular activity i.e. intrinsic motivation (Deci, 1975). On the other hand, controlled actions are those which are determined externally. Therefore, they come as a result of extrinsic motivation (Brophy, 2004). Studies have shown that intrinsically-oriented learning tends to be more beneficial than extrinsically-oriented, since intrinsically-motivated people show enhanced performance, persistence, and creativity (Deci–Ryan, 1991), as well as self-esteem (Deci–Ryan, 1995). However, the attitude towards extrinsic motivation has changed. Today, it is thought that intrinsic motivation and extrinsic reward can work together toward motivated learning (Topalov, 2011).

Gifted learners can be both intrinsically and extrinsically motivated. Intrinsic motivation is considered to be a hallmark of gifted learners (Winner, 1996). Their self-driven desire allows them to focus on the same activity for a long

time, without distraction (Brophy, 2004). A disadvantage of their strong motivation may be exhaustion (Roepert, 1991). However, talented learners can also be extrinsically-motivated. Analyzing the study conducted by National Defense Education Act (NDEA), which examined gifted-student motivation, Drews noted that around 60% of students were extrinsically-oriented (as cited in Kerr, 2009). She named this group “the studious,” and claimed that they needed assistance in pursuing their goals.

2.6. Plutchik's eight primary emotions

In this paper, eight primary emotion dimensions of gifted students will be explored: Destruction, Reproduction, Incorporation, Orientation, Protection, Deprivation, Rejection and Exploration (following Plutchik, 1980). Destruction is connected with the removal of an obstacle which prevents an organism from satisfying an important need. Aggressive actions are characteristic of this type of behavior. People who score high on this dimension are outspoken and resistant (Kostić, 2003: 75). Opposed to Destruction, Protection is a behavior which is directed towards the avoidance of danger. It is connected with fear, and the higher it is, the more cautious and insecure the respondents are (Kostić, 2003: 73). Incorporation reflects the behavior of a person who receives a positive stimulus from their environment. These emotions are associated with meeting a member of our group, who is then interpreted as a friend. High incorporation is a sign of the acceptance of ideas and people (Kostić, 2003: 72). On the other hand, Rejection is a behavior which is connected with the feelings of disgust. It is based on the rejection of another person or their ideas, so the respondents who score low on this are prone to rejecting people and their ideas (Kostić, 2003: 75). Reproduction is connected with the feelings of closeness and joy. It is also closely bound to our ability to reproduce. On the other hand, Deprivation is associated with losing something of value, leading to an interpretation of abandonment. It is often associated with weeping behavior, which reflects a desire to reattach to what we have lost. Therefore, the respondents who score high on Reproduction are expected to be sociable, cordial, friendly and helpful, whereas the respondents who score high on Deprivation are expected to be sad and pessimistic (Kostić, 2003: 74-76). Finally, Orientation is reaction to an unknown stimulus, which helps us to take time to orient ourselves to the event or object. Orientation is characterized by the lack of control and the element of surprise, which is why a high score on this dimension implies impulsiveness and curiosity (Kostić, 2003: 73). In contrast to Orientation, Exploration is associated with seeing ‘new territory’ in the external environment. A

person has some time to plan their actions and actively take part in that territory with their knowledge and experience. Respondents who score high on Exploration express their need to understand the environment and are well-organised and balanced (Kostić, 2003: 76). Desirable levels of all dimensions on the test are between the 40th and 60th percentile (Kostić, 2003). In this case, a person has an emotionally well-integrated personality. In his later model, Plutchik (2002) linked these eight types of behavior to eight basic emotions; anger, anticipation, joy, trust, fear, surprise, sadness and disgust.

3. METHOD

3.1. Participants

The participants in this study were two teenage students, preparing for the Cambridge Certificate in Advanced English (CAE) exam at a language school in Novi Sad in the Spring semester of 2016. Since both participants were under 18, their parents signed a consent form. The advanced level obtained in English at the young age of the respondents, in addition to standardized tests they had both passed, were the basis for the assumption that they are both exceptionally talented language learners. Neither had spent time living in an English-speaking country. Moreover, the teacher reported that they performed considerably better than their group peers in all class activities. They will hereafter be referred to as Mary and John, in order to protect their privacy.

Mary is a fourteen-year-old girl, who passed a standardized test for bilingual English study at 'Jovan Jovanović Zmaj' High School in Novi Sad. Her native language is Serbian and she speaks French as her third language.

John is a sixteen-year-old boy, who passed a standardized test for Karlovačka High School, Modern Languages Department in Sremski Karlovci. His native language is Serbian, and he also speaks French as his third language.

3.2. Instruments

3.2.1. Emotions Profile Index

The instrument for measuring personality characteristics was the Emotions Profile Index (EPI) questionnaire, based on the theory of emotions, proposed by Kellerman–Plutchik (1968) and complemented later by Plutchik (1980). The data collection procedure via a two-alternative forced choice method with pair-comparisons of twelve self-describing adjectives provides an eight-dimensional

emotional profile of the respondent. The task of the respondent is to circle the adjective which describes him/her better. The revised and standardized version of the Yugoslav test was used in the current study (Kostić, 2003). This test is claimed to have positive metric characteristics (Kostić, 2003).²

The test consists of eight constructs: Destruction (DES), Reproduction (REP), Incorporation (INC), Orientation (ORI), Protection (PRO), Deprivation (DEP), Rejection (REJ) and Exploration (EXP). Each of the constructs stands in opposition to the other: Destruction versus Protection, Incorporation versus Rejection, Reproduction versus Deprivation, and Orientation versus Exploration (Plutchik, 1980). Average results are between the 40th and 60th percentiles, whereas low results are under the 40th percentile and high results above the 60th percentile (Kostić, 2003). When one of the two opposite subscales is low, while the other is high, a person does not view this as a problem. However, if a person scores extremely high or low in two constructs which stand in opposition, there is a conflict present in that emotional dimension (Kostić, 2003).

3.2.2. Intrinsic Motivation Inventory Test

The instrument for measuring motivation consisted of a set of 23 randomly ordered items of the Intrinsic Motivation Inventory test developed by Deci–Ryan (2000). Each item belonged to one of the following sub-categories of motivation: Interest/Enjoyment, Effort/Importance, Perceived Choice and Value/Usefulness. Although the questionnaire is called the Intrinsic Motivation Inventory, there is only one subscale that assesses intrinsic motivation alone (Interest/Enjoyment). The instrument was adapted by modifying the items in the Value/Usefulness sub-category so that they would fit the purpose of research, which was to examine the talented student's motivation for learning a foreign language. The author modified the items so that they refer to learning English. Students were asked to select a number on a scale from 1 to 5 which represented the extent to which a given statement was true for them (1=not true at all; 2=a little bit true; 3=neither true, nor untrue; 4=true; 5=very true).

Seven items of the questionnaire belonged to the Interest/Enjoyment sub-category, with two negative statements whose score was reversed. Five items of the

² The results were interpreted with the help of a psychologist, specialized in child psychology, who works as a special education advisor in a secondary school dormitory in Novi Sad.

questionnaire belonged to the Effort/Importance sub-category, with two negative statements whose score was reversed. Five items of the questionnaire belonged to the Perceived Choice sub-category, with three negative statements whose score was reversed. Six items of the questionnaire belonged to the Value/Usefulness sub-category.

3.3. Procedure

Testing took place on the 17th of June, 2016 at a language school in Novi Sad. The tests were distributed by their teacher, who explained what they should do and made sure they understood the instructions. The participants did the Emotions Profile Index test first, followed by the Intrinsic Motivation Inventory test. The testing lasted approximately fifteen minutes.

4. RESULTS

4.1. Emotions Profile Index

4.1.1. MARY

While looking at Mary's Destruction and Protection dimensions presented in Table 1, it is important to say that both displayed above average values. This shows a conflict, because the person simultaneously experiences strong fear in a certain situation and a need to react decisively. People who score high on Destruction can be described as independent intellectuals who express their ideas freely. Moreover, they often live in a world of their own ideas, neglecting reality (Kostić, 2003: 75). Mary could also be rebellious and misunderstood by her peers and family. Since she scored high on Protection as well, she tends to avoid uncomfortable situations and stimuli. Moreover, she worries about what other people think about her (Kostić, 2003: 73).

As could be expected from some talented children who are anxious in novel situations (Klein, 2007), Mary scored very low on Incorporation. This means that she is distrustful, doubtful, and generally reserved towards other people. However, this also means that she is not prone to making impulsive decisions (Kostić, 2003: 72). The value for Rejection was slightly above the average. This means that she has a tendency to reject other people and their ideas (Kostić, 2003: 75).

Regarding Reproduction-Deprivation, Mary scored low on Reproduction, whereas her result for Deprivation reached almost maximum. Since the result for Deprivation was so high, this means that socialization is not very important for her.

She can live with a few friends, since she is quite detached from social relations and introverted. However, this result can cause the feelings of despondency, sadness, emotional tension and an impression of emptiness (Kostić, 2003: 74).

Finally, Mary's result for Exploration was very high, while her result for Orientation was quite low. This means that she has expectations that greater knowledge will bring her better functioning. She is organized and stable. She has a solid level of self-control. She usually plans her activities and is capable of long periods of work and dedication (Kostić, 2003: 76). On the other hand, her low score on Orientation means that she is insecure with the unknown. She does not want to undergo new situations and experiences. She is very cautious and can have difficulty adapting to a new environment (Kostić, 2003: 74).

Table 1 –Mary's EPI

Dimension	INC	PRO	ORI	DEP	REJ	DES	EXP	REP
Score	6	30	18	34	16	15	35	8
Percentile	1	73	20	95	58	83	87	2

4.1.2. JOHN

As can be seen in table 2, John's scores indicate a psychological profile of a stable, well-balanced teenager. Destruction and Protection constructs show a slight imbalance, in favor of Destruction. This means that John tends to be incautious, which is expected for his age (Kostić, 2003: 73).

As far as Incorporation and Rejection are concerned, both displayed around average scores. The score for Rejection was higher, which means that John does not restrain from standing up for his opinion, even though he cares about good relations with his peers. Closely connected to Incorporation, his score for Reproduction was slightly above average. On the other hand, the score for Deprivation was quite low. This means that John accepts people as they are and wants to fit in (Kostić, 2003: 74).

Finally, the only two subscales that show a greater imbalance are Exploration-Orientation. John scored very low on Exploration, whereas his result for Orientation was very high. This implies that John is very impulsive and full of childlike curiosity. He is eager for new experiences, which he rationalizes in the following way: "Now I also know how that looks like" (Kostić, 2003: 73).

Table 2 –John’s EPI

Dimension	INC	PRO	ORI	DEP	REJ	DES	EXP	REP
Score	55	14	36	10	18	18	6	37
Percentile	47	23	84	29	67	68	15	55

4.2. Motivation

The scores for motivation, given in table 3, show that Mary is more intrinsically motivated, whereas John is more extrinsically-oriented. Sub-categories of Interest/Enjoyment and Perceived Choice both scored higher than Value/Usefulness in Mary’s case. Mary reports to enjoy the activities in class to a considerable extent (3.71). She also quite firmly believes that learning English was her choice (3.8). The only sub-category which was scored lower than Value/Usefulness (3.5) was Effort/Importance (2.6).

In John’s case, Value/Usefulness was significantly higher than other sub-categories and reached almost maximum (4.83) which implies that an award is the most important motivational factor for him in language learning. The sub-category of Perceived Choice was quite high (3.6), which suggests that John believes he had a choice about learning English. His Interest/Enjoyment reached an average score (3), which means that he neither enjoys the activities in class too much, nor finds them boring. However, his score for Effort/Importance was very low (1.4). It is somewhat surprising that this sub-category scored so low in both students.

Table 3: Motivation - average result per category

	Interest/Enjoyment	Effort/Importance	Perceived Choice	Value/Usefulness
Mary	3.71	2.6	3.8	3.5
John	3	1.4	3.6	4.83

4.3. Discussion

4.3.1. Interpretation of the results

Mary’s emotional profile almost perfectly corresponds to the characteristics of talented children discussed in the theory section. First, regarding emotions, she is prone to feelings of fear, anxiety and sadness. Closely connected to this, Mary shows features of perfectionist behavior. She tends to carefully plan her activities.

Moreover, spending hours doing an important activity does not seem to be a problem for her. When it comes to creativity-related traits, Mary appears to have an independent, autonomous and introverted personality, which is in accordance with Simonton's (1999) characteristics of a creative individual. However, Mary also lacks some of these traits. Namely, she does not seem to be very open to new ideas and experiences. Finally, Mary's results imply that she does have socialization issues. She is quite introverted and reserved towards people. Yet, this does not seem to pose a problem for her, which is also in accordance with previous studies (Kerr, 2009).

On the other hand, John's emotional profile seems more stable. John does not seem to share Mary's perfectionism or introversion. On the contrary, he seems to care about status in his social group. As mentioned in the theory section, not all gifted children are necessarily perfectionists (Parker, 2002) or introverts (Williams, 1992). However, John shows some important aspects of creativity that Mary lacks. He shows a wide array of interests and enjoys new experiences, which are some of the characteristics of creative individuals, outlined by Simonton (1999).

These seemingly irreconcilable profiles of two gifted learners can be interpreted within Cattell's theory of personality (Cattell, 1963). According to the studies conducted in this field (Cattell–Butcher, 1968; Cattell–Drevdahl, 1955), a distinction can be made between an artistic and a scientific personality on three levels: ego strength (C factor), temperament (H factor) and alienation from the society (factor M). While artists are intolerant to frustration, emotionally unstable and moody (C- factor), scientists are mature, persistent and emotionally stable (C+ factor). Furthermore, artists avoid decision-making, whereas scientists approach problems realistically. Artists are also anxious, reserved, shy, inhibited, conscientious and not very confident (H- factor), whereas scientists are adventure-seeking, sociable, cordial, honest, impulsive, confident and carefree (H+ factor). Finally, artists are eccentric, aesthetically picky, independent, self-sufficient, and introverted (M+ factor). On the other hand, scientists are conventional, practical, logical, conscientious and well-balanced (M- factor). If we compare the characteristics obtained in the EPI test with these traits, Mary would fit in the description of an artist, whereas John would correspond to the image of a scientist.

As discussed in the results section, Mary and John's motivations seem to be rather different. It was unexpected that the Effort/Importance sub-category would score low, especially when we take into account their remarkable results in language learning at such a young age. One possible reason for this may be that self-report scales are subject to the individual's interpretation (Fulmer–Frijters,

2009). Another possible explanation is that the students do not perceive their English classes as difficult. Therefore, they report that they do not put a lot of energy into the learning process.

Self-report scale methods have some drawbacks. In addition to the individual interpretations problem already mentioned, it treats motivation as a stable trait, although some lines of research suggest that motivation is a fluid concept that changes across situations (Hidi–Renninger, & Krapp, 1992). This could be improved by testing motivation longitudinally. Moreover, self-report methods can be combined with alternative methods (Fulmer–Frijters, 2009), in order to strengthen the validity of the results obtained.

4.3.2. Implications for teaching

The outlined differences between the two students imply how diverse their needs in learning might be. This is why an individual approach in teaching needs to be taken. Working with mentors has already been reported to provide excellent results (Adžić, 2011).

When it comes to Mary, she does not need a lot of additional motivation, since she is already intrinsically-motivated. She enjoys the activities she does in class, and she is capable of long hours of dedication and concentration. What she needs though, is to be emotionally supported and constantly reassured of her ability. From her personality profile, it is clear that she is a perfectionist, who tends to worry a lot. Hence, her teacher should praise her results, even when they are not perfect.

As far as John is concerned, since his motivation is strongly extrinsically-oriented, the scores on the CAE test can be used as an impetus for harder work. John’s psychological profile shows a lack of organizational abilities. This is an aspect of his personality that needs to be worked on, because some parts of the CAE exam require careful planning. Moreover, longer sessions of training need to be included in classes, because John may find the necessity to concentrate for a long time especially difficult.

5. CONCLUSION

The results of the tests illustrate how different the individual characteristics of gifted learners may be. This study has revealed that two profiles of gifted students can be distinguished: artistic and scientific. Moreover, they can be both intrinsically and extrinsically oriented. In the future, it would be interesting to

follow the development of their personality traits and motivation longitudinally, in order to see how persistent they are. Future research should involve a greater number of participants and other personality and motivational tests could be used in order to confirm the obtained results.

In conclusion, giftedness can relate to a whole array of personality and motivational characteristics. Since talented children are often characterized by specific emotions, giftedness needs to be treated accordingly. Without the support of their families, educators and the environment, gifted students may not fulfill their potential (Kirk et al., 2009). Therefore, it is not enough to take care of the talented students' cognitive characteristics; their motivation and personality traits are crucial to the learning process as well, and should be carefully catered to.

Nina Ilić

PROFIL LIČNOSTI I MOTIVACIJA NADAREN OG UČENIKA ENGLESKOG JEZIKA

Rezime

Prethodne studije su pokazale da jezički nadarene učenike karakterišu intenzivne emocije, anksioznost, perfekcionizam koji može biti zdrav, ali i disfunkcionalan, kreativnost, problemi u socijalizaciji, kao i izražena introvertnost (mada nadareni učenici mogu biti i ekstrovertni). Što se njihove motivacije tiče, ona može biti ekstrinzička ili intrinzička. Sve ove karakteristike treba uzeti u obzir pri izradi kurikulumu za učenje stranog jezika. Cilj trenutne studije je da ustanovi profil ličnosti, kao i motivacioni profil talentovanog učenika engleskog jezika, koji bi poslužio kao polazna tačka za nastavnike u kreiranju efikasnog programa. Testirana su dva nadarena učenika engleskog jezika koji su se pripremali za polaganje CAE ispita (engl. Cambridge English Advanced) u jednoj školi engleskog jezika u Novom Sadu. Instrument korišćen za merenje ličnih karakteristika bio je PIE test (Profil indeks emocija) (Kellerman–Plutchik, 1968; Plutchik, 1980). Instrument korišćen za merenje motivacije bio je Inventar intrinzičke motivacije (Deci–Ryan, 2000). Rezultati testa ličnosti ukazuju na to da se naši ispitanici profilisu u dva tipa nadarenih učenika –umetnički i naučnički. Dok jednog ispitanika karakterišu intenzivne emocije (strah, anksioznost, tuga), perfekcionizam, opreznost, nezavisnost, autonomnost i introvertnost, kao i problemi u socijalizaciji, drugog ispitanika karakterišu impulsivnost, društvenost, ekstrovertnost, radoznalost i stabilnost. Prva grupa osobina uklapa se u sliku umetnika, dok se druga uklapa u sliku naučnika. Što se testa motivacije tiče, pokazalo se da talentovani učenici mogu biti i intrinzički i ekstrinzički orijentisani. Navedene razlike između dva učenika ukazuju na to koliko drugačije njihove potrebe u učenju mogu biti. Iz tog razloga je neophodno zauzeti individualni pristup u podučavanju. U budućnosti bi trebalo sprovesti istraživanje sa većim brojem ispitanika, kako bi se potvrdile ove tendencije.

Ključne reči: ličnost, motivacija, nadareni đaci, učenje stranog jezika, podučavanje

REFERENCES

- Adžić, D. (2011). Darovitost i rad s darovitim učenicima, Kako teoriju prenijeti u praksu. *Život i škola*, 57 (25), 171–184.
- Al-Khasawneh, F.–Al-Omari, M. (2015). Motivations towards learning English: The case of Jordanian gifted students. *International Journal of Education*, 7(2), 306–321.
- Brophy, J. (2004). *Motivating students to learn*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cattell, R. B. (1963). The personality and motivation of the researcher from measurements of contemporaries and from biography. In: Taylor, C. W. (ed.) (1963). *The identification of creative scientific talent*. New York: Wiley. 119–131.
- Cattell, R. B.–Drevdahl, J. E. (1955). A comparison of the personality profile (16 P.F.) of eminent teachers and administrators, and of the general population. *British Journal of Psychology*, 46, 248–261.
- Cattell, R. B.–Butcher, H. J. (1968). *The prediction of achievement and creativity*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.
- Cross, T.–Cassady, J. & Miller, K. (2006). Suicide ideation and personality characteristics among gifted adolescents. *GiftedChild Quarterly*, 50, 295–306.
- Deci, E. (1975). *Intrinsic Motivation*. New York: Plenum.
- Deci, E.–Ryan, R. (1991). A motivational approach to self: Integration in personality. In: Dienstbier, R. (ed.). (1991). *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation: Vol. 38. Perspectives on motivation*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press. 237–288.
- Deci, E.–Ryan, R. (1995). Human autonomy: The basis for true self-esteem. In: Kernis, M. (ed.). (1995). *Efficacy, agency, and self-esteem*. New York: Plenum. 31–49.
- Deci, E.–Ryan, R. (2000). The “What” and “Why” of Goal Pursuits: Human Needs and the Self-Determination of Behaviour. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11, 227–268.
- Delbridge-Parker, L.–Robinson, D. C. (1988). Type and academically gifted adolescents. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 17, 66–72.

- Fulmer, S. M.–Frijters, J. C. (2009). A review of self-report and alternative approaches in the measurement of student motivation. *Educational Psychology Review*, 21(3), 219-246.
- Gallagher, S. A. (1990). Personality patterns of the gifted. *Understanding Our Gifted*, 3, 11–13.
- Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gass, S. M.–Selinker, L. (1994). *Second language acquisition: An introductory course*. Hillsdale, NJ/London: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Heylighen, F. Characteristics and Problems of the Gifted: neural propagation depth and flow motivation as a model of intelligence and creativity (ECCO working paper 2006-05). Vrije Universiteit, Brussel, Belgium. Preuzeto 7. aprila 2019, sa <http://pespmc1.vub.ac.be/Papers/GiftednessModel.pdf>
- Hidi, S.–Renninger, K. A. & Krapp, A. (1992). The present state of interest research. In: Renninger, K.–Hidi, A. S. & Krapp, A. (ed.) (1992). *The role of interest in learning and development*. Hillsdale: Erlbaum. 433–447.
- Hoehn, L.–Birely, M. K. (1988). Mental processing preferences of gifted children. *Illinois Council for the Gifted Journal*, 7, 28–31.
- Janos, P. M.–Fung, H. & Robinson, N. M. (1985). Self concept, self esteem, and peer relations among gifted children who feel “different.” *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 29, 78–82.
- Janos, P. M.–Marwood, K. A. & Robinson, N. M. (1985). Friendship patterns in highly intelligent children. *Roeper Review*, 46, 46–49.
- Kahyaoğlu, M. (2013). A comparison between gifted students and non-gifted students’ learning styles and their motivation styles towards science learning. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 8(12), 890-896.
- Kamarulzaman, M. H.–Ibrahim, N.–Md Yunus, M.& Mohd Ishak, N. (2013). Language anxiety among gifted learners in Malaysia. *English Language Teaching*, 6(3), 20-29.
- Kellerman, H.–Plutchik, R. (1968). Emotion-trait interrelations and the measurement of personality. *Psychological Reports*, 23, 1107-1114.
- Kerr, B. (2009). *Encyclopedia of giftedness, creativity, and talent* (Volumes 1 and 2). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kirk, S.–Gallagher, J.–Coleman, M. R. & Anastasiow, N. (2009). *Educating exceptional children* (12th edition). Boston: Houghton.
- Klein, B. (2007). *Raising gifted kids: Everything you need to know to help your exceptional child thrive*. New York: AMACOM.

- Kokot, S. (1999). *Help Our Child is Gifted, Revision Edition*. Redford House Publication, Henkos Printers (Pty) Ltd. Republic of South Africa.
- Kostić, P. (2003). *Priručnik PIE-JRS. Profil indeks emocija, Jugoslovenska revizija i standardizacija, treće izdanje*. Beograd: Centar za primenjenu psihologiju.
- Lightbown, P.–Spada, N. M. (2006). *How languages are learned*. Oxford:Oxford University Press.
- Mills, C. J.–Parker, W. D. (1998). Cognitive-psychological profiles of gifted adolescents from Ireland and the U. S.: Cross-societal comparison. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 22(1), 1–16.
- Parker, W. D. (2002). Perfectionism and adjustment in gifted children. In: P. Hewitt–Flett, G. (ed.) (2002). *Perfectionism: Theory, research, and treatment*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. 133–148.
- Pfeiffer, S. I. (2008). *Handbook of giftedness in children*. New York: Springer.
- Plutchik, R. (1980). *Emotion: A psychoevolutionary synthesis*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Plutchik, R. (2002). *Emotions and life: Perspectives from psychology, biology, and evolution*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Renzulli, J. S. (1986). The three-ring conception of giftedness: A developmental model for creative productivity. In: Sternberg, R. J.–Davidson, J. E. (ed.) (1986). *Conceptions of giftedness*. New York: Cambridge University Press. 53-92.
- Roeper, A. (1991). Gifted adults: Their characteristics and emotions. *Advanced Development*, 3, 85-98.
- Rubin, J. (2005). The Expert Language Learner: A Review of Good Language Learner Studies and Learner Strategies. In: Johnson, K. (ed.) (2005). *Expertise in Second Language Learning and Teaching*. Basingstoke, England: Palgrave Macmillan. 37-63.
- Sak, I. (2004). A synthesis of research on psychological types of gifted adolescents. *Journal of Secondary Gifted Education*, 15, 70–79.
- Silverman, L. K. (1994). Affective Curriculum for the Gifted. In: VanTassel-Baska, J. (2nd ed.) (1994). *Comprehensive Curriculum for Gifted Learners*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon. 325-346.
- Simonton, D. (1999). *Origin of genius: Darwinian perspectives on creativity*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Terman, L.–Oden, M. (1947). *The gifted child grows up: Twenty-five-year follow-up of a superior group* (Vol. 4). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Topalov, J. (2011). *Motivacija u nastavi stranog jezika*. Novi Sad: Prosveta.

- Williams, R. (1992). Personality characteristics of talented and gifted students as measured by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator and Murphy - Meisgeir Type Indicator for children. (Doctoral dissertation, East Texas State University, 1992). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 53, 111.
- Winner, E. (1996). The rage to master: The decisive role of talent in the visual arts. In: Ericsson, K. A. (ed.) (1996). *The road to excellence: The acquisition of expert performance in the arts and sciences, sports, and games*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum. 271–301.